CHAPTER IV

METHOD AND PROCEDURE
METHOD AND PROCEDURE

The present investigation is, "A comparative study of teacher pupil relationship in public schools and other schools in U.P." The relationship between teacher and student is mainly determined by the teacher's attitude towards the students and the students' attitude towards the teacher. These attitudes depend on the fact how the teachers and students perceive each other. When the teacher perceives the pupil as a trouble maker or dis-interested his attitude towards him will be less positive than if he perceives him as a cooperative interested learner. In this study data were obviously collected from both teachers and students by employing suitable tools.

The investigator selected public and non-public schools of U.P. Public School in Uttar Pradesh are residential and uni-sexed schools. The pattern of each school is always similar. In public schools there are two kinds of schools found in Uttar Pradesh i.e. Public Sainik School and Public Schools. Both types of schools are taken into consideration. Whereas in non-public schools, there are single sexed schools as well as co-educational schools. The investigator selected both types of schools from rural and urban areas for this comparative study.

Tools Used:

The investigator reviewed previous studies and found that Tchechtelin (1940) devised an attitude test for measuring
the attitudes of pupils for their teachers. The major aspects of the teachers' personality taken into consideration were:

1. Liking for the teacher
2. Ability to explain
3. Kindliness and friendliness and understanding
4. Fairness in marking
5. Keeping order with children
6. Amount of work required
7. Liking for the lessons

Jersild (1943) believes that the following characteristics should be considered as far as teachers are concerned:

1. Human qualities as a person
2. Physical appearance, grooming voice
3. Characteristic as disciplinarian or director of the class
4. Performance as a teacher
5. Participation in activities; Providing gaiety or entertainment
6. Miscellaneous and general

Reyana (1951) has classified four dimensions of pupils' classroom behaviour (alert-apathetic, responsible-obstructive, confident-uncertain, initiating-dependent) and eighteen teacher behaviour (Fair-partial, democratic, autocratic, responsive-allof, understanding-restricted, kindly-harsh, stimulating-dull, original-sterotyped, alter-apathetic, attractive-unimpressive, responsible-evading, steady-erratic, poised-exitable, confident-uncertain, systematic-disorganized, adoptable-inflexible, optimistic-pessimistic, integrated -
immature, broad-narrow).

Tyler (1962) asked 800 children from primary and secondary schools to rank items descriptive of a "good teacher" in four scales. The findings are as follows:

1. Discipline
2. Teaching and personal qualities
3. Sympathetic attitude
4. Cheerfulness and sense of humour

Micheal (1957) attempted to ascertain the attitudes of 976 students towards factors considered to be of importance of class-room enjoyment and towards teachers' evaluations. The relative importance of six factors ranked with respect to their significance in contribution to the class-room enjoyment were:

1. Teacher's methods of teaching
2. Teacher's personality
3. Confidence in teacher's knowledge of the subject
4. Good marks obtained in the class
5. Short assignments
6. No special emphasis on discipline

In the questionnaire students were asked to specify other factors that they considered to be important as the follows:

1. Lack of favouratism on the part of teacher
2. Special interest of teacher in individual student
3. Opportunity of group discussions and participation of the teacher in them
4. Morale in the class
In a detailed study Bush (1957) used a rating scale developed by Bryan (1937) which consisted of twenty items which are as follows:

1. Knowledge of the teacher
2. Teacher's fairness in marking
3. Personal liking towards teacher
4. Learning from this teacher
5. Subject liked by the student
6. Discipline in the classroom
7. Sympathy
8. Value of the study, the topics and problems of this class
9. Ability to assist students in planning and organizing class-room work
10. Explaining things clearly
11. Fairness of this teacher's decision regarding the students
12. All round ability of the teacher
13. Personal appearance of this teacher
14. Share decisions with students
15. Freedom of work
16. Concern about students problems and understanding
17. Liking of teacher for students
18. Any likable quality possessed by the teacher which is not mentioned above
19. Any undesirable quality or habit possessed by teacher which is not mentioned above
20. Any other comment to indicate the judgement of this teacher.

In a critical evaluation of the items considered significant for the evaluation of teacher's characteristics it is realised that the following three items have been in frequently used:
(1) Any likable quality possessed by the teacher which is not mentioned above
(2) Any undesirable quality or habit possessed by teacher which is not mentioned above
(3) Any other comment to indicate the judgement of this teacher

Thus we are left with seventeen items. These seventeen items reveal the reaction of the pupils to the personality of each teacher in the class and his reaction to the class as a whole.

These seventeen characteristics were evaluated by the students on a five point scale. Such biographical informations as age, sex, religion, rural/urban background and the class in which the student was studying, parents education, occupation, income etc. were also recorded.

Another scale with nine items was used to gauge the characteristics of students. This scale was administered to the teachers to ascertain their reactions about their students. This was again a five point scale. This scale was originally developed by American council of Education. This five point scale consisting of nine items gives the teacher's opinion about pupil's present and future success and adjustment:

(1) Efforts
(2) Method
(3) Conduct
(4) Quality of thinking
(5) Teacher's liking for student
(6) Social adjustment (child)
(7) Social adjustment (adult)
(8) Emotional balance of the child
(9) Knowledge and career

Validity

The validity of both the scales on the whole was tested by correlating each characteristics of the subjects with personal liking. The product moment was used for the calculation of co-efficient of correlation. In student's questionnaire each of the sixteen characteristics of teachers as perceived by their students were correlated with their liking for the teachers by product moment method. The same method was used for verifying the validity of teachers scale by relating the teacher's personal liking for the students. The level of significance for their relationships was also determined.

By using random sampling, we selected 45 students. Their perceptions of teachers' characteristics and teachers responses about them were noted. Table I gives a detailed list of correlational values and the level of significance of personal liking of students with other characteristics possessed by the teacher and also shows the product moment co-efficients of correlation between personal liking and other characteristics of teachers.

In Table-II, the correlation factors relating the personal liking of teacher with other qualities possessed by their
students and their level of significance are shown.

As indicated in Table-II, all the correlations were found to be significant at .01 level and hence there exists a positive relationship in all the cases. It shows that both of our scales are valid and will fulfil our purpose.

**TABLE- I**

Showing a detailed list of correlational values and level of significance of personal liking of students with other characteristics possessed by the teacher and also the product moment co-efficients of correlation between personal liking and other characteristics of teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Characteristics of teachers</th>
<th>Co-efficient of correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>.499 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Fairness of grading</td>
<td>.280 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Amount of learning</td>
<td>.367 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Discipline ability</td>
<td>.936 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Subject Interest</td>
<td>.366 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Sympathy</td>
<td>.289 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Teacher's utility</td>
<td>.290 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Planning and Organization</td>
<td>.356 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Explaining Capability</td>
<td>.395 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Fairness of Decision</td>
<td>.410 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>All round ability</td>
<td>.428 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Personal Appearance</td>
<td>.326 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Share Decision</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Freedom of work</td>
<td>-.0058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Concern about pupils problems</td>
<td>.345 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Teacher's Personal liking</td>
<td>-.088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 1% level
** Significant at 5% level
TABLE - II

Showing the correlation factors relating the personal liking of teacher with other qualities possessed by their students and their level of significance are shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Characteristics of students</th>
<th>Co-efficient of correlations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>.520 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>.791 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Conduct</td>
<td>.548 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Quality of thinking</td>
<td>.639 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Social adjustments (Peers)</td>
<td>.456 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Social adjustments (Adults)</td>
<td>.424 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>.302 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Academic Career</td>
<td>.411 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 1% level.
Reliability:

In order to find out the reliability of the test it was administered to fifty subjects randomly drawn from the schools to obtain their scores on the scales. The split-half method was employed to determine the reliability of the test. For this purpose the scores obtained after the test were divided into odd and even scores. Pearson product Moment correlation technique was applied to the data. The correlational value which was found to be indicated reliability of the test, In order to find out the reliability of the test, Spearman Brown Prophacy formula was used. Reliability co-efficients for the students and teachers scales were .98 & .98 respectively. The co-efficients were statistically significant beyond 1% level, so it was inferred that the rating scale was a reliable instrument for measuring attitudes.

Sampling:

The investigator mailed many letters to the heads of various educational institutions in Uttar Pradesh, explaining to them the purpose of the study and sought permission to collect data from their institutions. The heads of some institutions in Lucknow, Dehradun, Varanasi and Jaunpur acknowledged the letters and showed their willingness to extend help and cooperation to the investigator for the collection of data from their institutions.
First of all data were obtained from Public Inter College Kerkat, Jaumpur, Sanatan Dharam Inter College, Jaunpur, and J.R. Girls Inter College Dobhi, Jaunpur. The researcher obtained the lists of students of IX and X classes studying in these institutions. A list of teachers taking IX and X classes was also secured from the heads of the institutions. As the number of students in these three educational institutions was quite large, the collection of data was spread over a week. Following the principle of simple random sampling the investigator selected every second student from each test, for inclusion in the sample. Thus data were to be obtained from 465 subjects from these institutions.

The Hindi Version of the rating scale, "What do you think of your teacher" was administered to those selected for the sample of the present study. The students were asked to read each of the seventeen statements carefully and to put a tick (✓) mark on any one of the five response categories which explicitly expressed their opinion about the teacher in question. The subjects acted accordingly and all of them were able to record their responses on the scale in about 45 minutes. The investigator spent seven days to collect data from the three educational institutions of the Jaunpur.

After collecting data from the students the investigator approached the teachers and requested them to rate the students
of their class on the five point scale. In all the institutions the teachers cooperated with the investigator.

The list of students was supplied to the teachers along with rating scales. Teachers were kind enough to return the duly filled scales to the investigator next day. Having completed collection, the investigator left Jaunpur and reached Lucknow. The investigator adopted the same procedure in collecting data from U.P. Sainik School. The investigator obtained data from students and teachers of Agerasen Kanya Inter College, Varanasi. Lastly, data were collected from teachers and students of Doon School, Dehradun by the investigator.

The data from 815 subjects were scrutinized. It was found that some of the questionnaires were either incomplete or not properly filled. Thus 132 questionnaires were discarded and 683 questionnaires which were completed and properly filled in were retained for the present research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Rural/Urban</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>U.P. Sainik School</td>
<td>Lucknow</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Doon School</td>
<td>Dehradoon</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Public Inter College</td>
<td>Jaunpur</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Sanatan Dharam Inter College</td>
<td>Janupur</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>J.R. Girls Inter College, Dobhi</td>
<td>Janupur</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Agerasen Kanya Inter College</td>
<td>Varanasi</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Subjects</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypotheses:

It would be clear that we selected three types of schools i.e. Public Schools (a), Non-Public (co-educational school) (b) and non-public (single sexed school); (c). In each school the attitude of students towards their teachers and the attitude of teachers towards their students have to be ascertained. The review of literature impresses us with the fact that there are some characteristics (knowledge, fairness in grading, discipline, sympathy, personal appearance etc.) on the basis of which the teachers are evaluated by their students. Similarly, the teachers evaluate their students on some characteristics (effort, method, social adjustment, emotional stability etc.). Thus it is proposed to set two types of hypotheses.

The attitude of teachers towards their students and vice-versa.

Hypotheses were also split into major and subsidiary ones. The major hypotheses, stated below, are based on cumulative scores. This is followed by comparison of each characteristic separately which constitute the subsidiary hypotheses. In order to make these hypotheses easily apprehensible various null hypotheses framed, are indicated in Appendix 'C'.

Major hypotheses are as follows:

(1) The students of non-public (co-educational) institutions would hold favourable attitude towards their teachers than the students of single sexed,
public schools.

(2) Students of non-public single sexed schools (C) would favourably endorse the characteristics possessed by the teachers than the students of public schools. (A).

(3) The teachers of public schools (A) would hold more favourable attitude towards individual characteristics possessed by their students than the teachers of non-public (co-educational) schools (B).

(4) The teachers of public schools (A) would hold more favourable attitude towards individual characteristics possessed by their students than the teachers of non-public (single sexed) schools (C).

These hypotheses have been statistically tested. The statistical methods used and various null hypotheses framed in support of general hypotheses are discussed at appropriate places. (See Appendices)

Statistical Analysis:

The rating scale through which data were obtained from the subjects were scored. As a five point rating scale ranged most favourable through neutral to least favourable. The following numbers 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1, respectively were assigned to five responses.

In scoring the questionnaire the frequency on each response was recorded.

Keeping in view the purpose of the present study, the Kolmogorov-Smirnow two sample test method was employed to
compare the teacher pupil relationship of the two types of schools. This two tailed test is sensitive to any kind of difference in the distribution from which the two samples were drawn—differences in location (central tendency) in dispersion, in skewness etc.